

adopted earlier and as you remember there were basically five sources of revenue, replacement revenue. Senator Hall has gotten up and has spoken about those revenues and those sources and where they come from. I intend to pull this amendment, but I want to explain why we're doing it and what the ramifications of doing it. Two of those appear, as Senator Hall has stated, to not be controversial or at least at this point in time have not drawn a lot of fire and, thus, have some acceptance, that being the retail collection fee and the depreciation surcharge. The other three are the access charges or the, also the telecommunications services and the common carriers. Those three sources of revenue were put on with less than 25 votes and were a majority. I think that we should take those off the table and start over. Senator Hall has pledged to this body, and I think that he will be able to do that and put a package of replacement revenue. The key is to not allow this to be a given, that these all are going to go back on. Senator Hall has agreed with me. I thank him for that. I will pull this amendment. He has agreed that these three items will not come back or at least will be part...there has to be a package examined on Select File that these three items are not given. They will not be placed on to do that, that there will be a replacement package that he is going to be working on to do that. Senator Hall, I thank you for that commitment to do that and with that, I would pull this amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: It is withdrawn. Next amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have nothing further pending to Senator Hall and Senator Will's amendment, AM1772.

SPEAKER BAACK: We will now go back to the Hall amendment, AM1772. Senator Hall, do you wish to address that amendment?

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. Just so that I guess we can run a scorecard on the amendment as to where we're at, this is what the proposal does. If you remember right, AM1772 was introduced as the proposal that Governor Nelson brought to the body. It takes on a fairly different complexion today after being debated for a couple days. It still retains the change in the refund schedule. We didn't alter that. It's one of about only two things we didn't deal with. So the refund schedule in terms of tightening up that with regard to the property tax statutes is retained in the proposal. We struck the motor vehicle fee. We left personal property taxing method